

OPEN LETTER TO THE WHITE LEFT IN THE U.S.

The White Left in the U.S. is bankrupt. This comes as news only to those in the White Left who absurdly believe otherwise, or who somehow confuse their sincerity with revolutionary politics. The White Left (New and Old) has become a necessary adjunct to the entire process of White bourgeois socialization in the U.S. It can be honestly said that the Leftist parties and associations of the U.S. are as necessary to the perpetuation of racism and White class domination as the middle class institutions of the status quo.

In the U.S., the White Left in general and the large communist and socialist parties in particular have long since relinquished any revolutionary claim hysterically directed at them by the reactionary, major political parties of the status quo. No longer does the White Left support the ultimate cause of the working class and its historical revolutionary role. Instead, the White Left subsumes its hunger for White bourgeois legitimacy behind marxist rhetoric and intellectual lip masturbation. The White Left and its major organizations support only "safe," tame, reformist struggles, labelling all who would go further in developing revolutionary contradictions as "adventurists."

The racist character of the White Left is concealed behind a progressive pretense only one step removed from White bourgeois liberalism. Seldom, if ever, does the White Left support the right of Black people to national self-determination and their right to organize an armed capacity to resist the aggression of the European Amerikan Capitalist State. Instead, the White Left supports individual cases of perceived "racism," "injustice," or "sexism," therein paying their obligatory dues. We are counselled that Black peoples' struggle must await conscious development of the White working class, and even further: that Black Nationalist divides the U.S. working class movement. The implication of this line is clear: "Niggers need White folks' approval" in order to proceed along their own historical road, begun with the introduction of the first African slaves into colonial america. The historical continuum of Blacks and Whites in the U.S. is conveniently butchered to conform with contemporary White left cowardice and racism, effectively absolving them of revolutionary responsibility during the present epoch.

The socialist and communist intellectual Black bourgeoisie are no better than their White counterparts, especially when these blacks are members of the bourgeois white leftist parties. These slick punks of the left view with contempt and fear all political Black activists that do not conveniently fit into the mass line of their respective organizations, organizations dominated by political gradualism, opportunism, and "time is not rightism." These Blacks wax very intellectual in their contempt for the extremism of the Black Nationalist left. How dare a lower class Black show more

over...

dedication to an ideal than they -- by putting their lives on the line for their beliefs? The urgency felt by revolutionary BlacksNationalists under the jackboot of the repressive capitalist state, while a catalyst for revolutionary action for some, is a reason for cowardice in others who do not share the same sense of urgency. The White Left does not share our sense of urgency because they do not share our reality and perceive the historical destiny of Blacks as identical to their own, instead of as related. Such false notions would be quickly dispelled with a materialist analysis of american history.

Yet the bankruptcy of the White Left in the U.S. is not unique to these shores. Nor does it only apply to Black/White relationships of the Left. It (White Left bankruptcy) is a symptom of the socio-economic development in the capitalist West, where the power and control of capital have looted the western communist parties of their revolutionary vitality by effectively arresting the self-identity of the industrial working classes.

Consequently, the bankruptcy fo the White Left has internal implications and affects the White Left's relationship to itself and to the very working classes they would lead. This contradiction is manifested in the position of most western communist parties to the younger, more militant european "New Left" groupings. The concept of euro-communism is its most putrid feature. Almost a hundred years ago, Marx asserted: a working class "at rest" has no identity. He did not mean objectively it was not a working class, but that subjectively, revolutionary consciousness of itself as a revolutionary class for itself was precluded without active struggle against its class enemy. Because the communist parties of Western Europe and in most Latin American countries view bourgeois legitimacy as primary instead of secondary, these parties actively collaborate with the forces of reaction and capital.. They do so in order to secure a legitimacy that only the entrenched bourgeoisie and capitalist can bestow, for even the most revisionist communist must agree that capitalism is a dictatorship of the capitalist class, regardless of the political organization such a dictatorship may assume. Accordingly, a communist party unwilling to push the contradictions of working class struggle beyond the legality of bourgeois reformism and unionism will itself be determined by that reformism. Hence, the working class such a party would pretend to lead will be led down the path of its natural class enemy. Chile is a case in point of such folly.

When it comes to colonialism, international and domestic, the bankruptcy of the left is just as evident. In each ex-colonial european western capitalist nation, the traditional White left has acted as a moderating voice against the colonial policies of their bourgeoisie. This, while good in itself, masks the class collaborationist nature of the White European Left. Never did the European left ascend to the principled level of unconditional revolutionary support for the national liberation movements themselves. Why? Was it because in each ex-colonial, capitalist nation the White left still identified with the narrow, racial and national interests of their own country, and hence, with the interests of their own national bourgeoisie? Or was it because identification with, and full support of, Third World liberation movements would erode white

left "legitimacy" at home? Apparently the answer is both class-national collaboration and political expediency. So much for theories of unity between international working classes, especially when they apply to under-developed peoples of color with little or no modern working class to speak of.

It should come as no surprise then, that the White left in modern western nations is inhibited by their own urge for bourgeois legitimacy, by their own cultural racism, and by the very process of western, working class cooptation. The sum of these parts add up to the revolutionary bankruptcy of the traditional White left in the modern capitalist nations.

Rather than grasp this concept and the revolutionary obligations that flow from it, the White left and white communists fall into the pits of over-intellectualism and endless debate over who has the locks on the ultimate truth -- who retains the undistilled pure ideology of marxism. Subjectively, most White leftists do not want to deal with the funky, unvarnished, stomped down in the gutter truth. So they devise all types of subjective reasoning for such avoidance of reality. This manifests itself in the attitudes of some White leftists. When a Black man, hard pressed by the very realities that "would-be" leftists conveniently avoid, is less than humble, reasonable, and convenient, he is immediately branded arrogant and prideful, and hence worthy of being politically ignored. Other defensive attitudes then follow: A Black man who espouses the truth as the conditions of combat and struggle dictate is considered "bitter" or hateful towards all Whites, or in the very least, resentful. This is not only comic, it's pathetic, because many Whites mistake intelligence for stupidity and cannot distinguish one from the other. This equals out to covert racism masquerading as quasi-ego analysis, which more often than not is an analysis of the White psychic instead of a Black man's ego. For this and other reasons, not a few White leftists find it easier to work with or support Black women who are not as "threatening" to their delicate White consciences. A Black person however, that has a full-blown (or over-blown) appreciation of his/her self-worth is the antithesis of a slave, for former Black slaves do not presume to be more qualified than their former slave masters; when they do, they are indeed arrogant! White leftists consistently fail to understand that respect and understanding pursue a different cultural and social pattern, one that cannot be erased by political discussion. And the requirements of survival are the ultimate political issues.

The human factor is the most dynamic factor in struggle and revolution. It is a conscious, living thing. We cannot engage in revolution and combat of a protracted nature and remain forgiving of the vacillation of others not so inclined. Revolution makes one intolerant because every day we are reminded that we must do what is of value, not for others, but because of our own self value. The failure of the White left to support the Black Liberation Movement is a failure of the White Left to support itself. It is not a question of helping us, but of manifesting what one is about -- and the White Left is obviously about bullshit ...

R. Dhoruba Moore
Frank Khali Abney
B.L.A.